

VOLUME 16

NUMBER 3

PRICE 7½p

APR 21 1975



Christian Order

Summary of Contents for March 1975

PHILOSOPHIES IN COLLISION 1	<i>B. A. Santamaria</i>
THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD	<i>The Editor</i>
REFLECTIONS ON HOUGHTON	<i>J. M. Jackson</i>
CHILDREN'S MASSES A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT	<i>Most Rev. Robert J. Dwyer</i>
THE EUCHARIST AND THE CHURCH OF TODAY	<i>Rev. Eugene More</i>
LAST STRAW?	<i>W. J. Morgan</i>

"The Church and the World"

Father Paul Crane, S.J.

will speak under this title

in Ireland

at

Dublin (Milltown Park), Friday, March 7th,

at 8 p.m.

Cork (St. Aloysius Hall, Sharman Crawford Street),

Saturday, March 8th, at 7.30 p.m.

Limerick (College of Education, South Circular Road),

Sunday, March 9th, at 8 p.m.

All are invited to these meetings which have been asked for and arranged by Father Crane's Irish friends. In his lectures Father Crane will analyze the sources of confusion in the Church today, show how the confusion itself may be overcome and indicate the signs that give hope for the future.

Contents

Page

130 STUMBLING SHEPHERDS
The Editor

132 CHILDREN'S MASSES
A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT
Most Rev. Robert J. Dwyer

136 THE EUCHARIST AND
THE CHURCH OF TODAY
I: SACRIFICE OF THE MASS
Rev. Eugene More

144 MARXIST BRIDGEHEADS
IN AFRICA
Czeslaw Jesman

148 PHILOSOPHIES IN
COLLISION: I
B. A. Santamaria

163 THE CHURCH AND THE
WORLD
I: CHRIST AND THE DEVIL
The Editor

174 REFLECTIONS ON
HOUGHTON
J. M. Jackson

182 ANY QUESTIONS?
William Lawson, S.J.

186 BOOK REVIEW

If You Change Your Address:
Please let us know two or
three weeks ahead if possible
and please send us both new
and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a
monthly magazine devoted to
the promulgation of Catholic
Social Teaching and incisive
comment on current affairs
in Church and State; at home
and abroad; in the political,
social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father
Paul Crane, S.J., from 65,
Belgrave Rd., London, S.W.1.
This is the sole postal
address to which all com-
munications concerning
Christian Order should be
sent.

Christian Order is obtain-
able only by subscription and
from this address. In the case
of those desiring more than
one copy, these are obtain-
able at the subscription rate
and should be paid for in
advance.

The annual subscription to
Christian Order is £1 in the
United Kingdom and
Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in
the United States, Canada
and Australia; elsewhere, ac-
cording to the approximate
sterling rate of exchange, in
the currency of the country
concerned or any convenient
currency.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 16

MARCH, 1975

NUMBER 3

Stumbling Shepherds

THE EDITOR

WHAT is required of any new bishop entering his diocese today is that he should be not only a man of God, but a man of courage; prepared to uphold the Church's teaching and to use his authority to uphold it. I am thinking particularly of the field of religious education wherever it may be given; but particularly, perhaps, in the school-room. For it is here that the attack is being made; here that it is being pressed relentlessly and, perhaps, mortally. Let me put the situation in simple terms: it is not, I think, by any means an exaggeration to say that now, in the Church in this country, a whole generation of children is being corrupted; placed, negatively by non-teaching, more positively by wrong teaching in a mental situation in which it would seem inevitable that they will lose their Faith—either because they are given nothing to believe in so that, in a sense, they have nothing to lose; or because they are positively robbed of what they did believe in, so that what they had they have already lost to all intents and purposes before they left school.

This is largely the truth. In many Catholic schools the Faith of a whole generation of Catholic children is being destroyed by teaching priests, religious and lay men and women, who follow their evil example. There are, of course,

magnificent exceptions; fine Catholic teachers are having to suffer much for the Faith at the hands of their co-religionists; some of them are making a splendid stand, but they are in danger of being overwhelmed. The general picture in the schools, where the teaching of religion is concerned, is one of decay and disintegration. Brain-washed at training colleges into the kind of approach to religion which starts with the "horizontal" and degenerates very quickly into the purely humanitarian, all too many teachers of religion in Catholic schools today are either incapable of instructing their pupils in the Faith of their Fathers or disinclined to do so. It is a tragic state of affairs and the tragedy will worsen as the years go by. The story is the same in seminaries and religious houses of study. The picture, in general, is one of decay. This is why the young will not go to them. This is why they are empty. The instinct of the young is right.

Parents know that their children are not being taught their religion—often robbed of their Faith—nowadays in Catholic Schools. They are disturbed by this evil. They are trying to fight against it. The same applies to those Catholic teachers who are doing all they can in the face of heavy odds. The tragedy, however, is that neither parents nor teachers are receiving effective episcopal support. It is incredible that this should be the case, but it is the case and there is no point in denying it because it is known to far too many. Bishops in this country and Superiors of Religious Orders are allowing a type of religious teaching which is destroying the Faith of thousands—maybe a whole generation—of Catholic children. In this grave matter they have deserted their people in their hour of need and they will be answerable to God for their desertion. There can be no excuses here, no words in explanation. What we see happening in this country now is what our Forefathers saw at the time of the Reformation—the desertion of the flock by its Shepherds. As a result of the first desertion, the Faith was stolen by stealth from our Forefathers. It must not be stolen from us.

Children's Masses

A Dangerous Precedent

MOST REV. ROBERT J. DWYER
(Former Archbishop of Portland, Oregon)

THERE are minor—if actually not major—consolations to advancing age unto the sear, the yellow leaf, in this declining third of the 20th century. Not the least of them is the reflection that we did our growing up when the century was young and were thus spared the agony, if also the ecstasy, of coming to what we humorously refer to as maturity in the vexed and troubled '60's and '70's.

Ours was, by and large, a safe world to grow up in, and the Church to which we pledged our faith and loyalty was a changeless Church.

So she seemed, at least, to our uncritical eye, as we followed the sacred liturgy through its rhythmical seasons and conned our catechism from the dog-eared pages of Baltimore, No. 2.

Nor did it ever occur to us, benighted as we were, sodden in our ignorance, and anaemic from lack of proper spiritual pabulum, that we were being systematically cheated of those choicer options which the obscurantism of the day kept safely from our grasp.

Sink or Swim

Not for us, in that insensitive era, some easy and familiar introduction to the liturgy, by way of a Mass specially tailored for minims, teen-agers, and adolescents.

We were plunged into the freezing cold waters of the old Latin liturgy and callously told to sink or swim. But so naive were we and unsophisticated that we never thought to protest or raise a shrill treble of remonstrance.

To the contrary, be it said to our utter shame, we took

to it as a duck to water, rejoicing in our first conquest of *Dominus Vobiscum*, and waiting impatiently for that day when Sister Dositheus would pronounce us sufficiently advanced in verbal and bodily dexterity to be allowed on the altar to serve our first Mass: *Introibo ad altare Dei; Ad Deum qui laetificat juventutem meam*.

How that *laetificat* issued from our lips in splendour, our first major triumph! And with what pride did our fond parents regard, from the distant vantage of their pew, the extraordinary exploits of their son and heir.

Shed a tear of compassion with us over a childhood thus abused and exploited! Had it only been our blessed privilege to be introduced to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in Simple Words of One Syllable, and instead of puzzling through the meanderings of Paul the Apostle, writing, say, in one of his more tortuous moods to the refractory Corinthians, have enjoyed the moral and cautionary tale of the Purple Velvetten Rabbit, how different would have been our total religious outlook as we breasted the difficult years of adolescence to finally arrive at man's estate.

And if, rather than the sometimes stern and minatory words of the Gospels, such as Our Lord's statement about those who are not with Him being against Him, we had heard only passages replete with love and sunshine, how much brighter might have been our entire spiritual outlook.

We would have missed that whole unhealthy business about sin and eternal damnation, spectres which haunt the morbid recesses of our consciousness even in this day of enlightenment.

'Bold' Liturgy

Well, the recollection is drear, and the wonder is that somehow we did survive, to emerge, at long last, into the Church as she would seem to prefer to manifest herself to men today, divested of mystery, speaking through a liturgy which even the illiterate can recognize as banal, and soon to be adapted to every last one of Shakespeare's Seven Ages of Man.

A beginning, we read, has been made with the broad sanction of a Liturgy for Children. The Holy See has authorized episcopal conferences and bishops in their dioceses to formulate, within due bounds, the Liturgy of the Word so as to adapt it to the capacity of those of tender years.

This permission, hailed in certain quarters, as "bold and innovative," comes, not in response to a demand of the various national hierarchies, but rather to the persistent urgings of a few liturgical experimentalists.

As a matter of cold fact neither the writer nor any bishop of his acquaintance has ever been asked by Rome for his opinion on the matter, and whenever, at the annual Conference of the American hierarchy the subject has been agitated, it has been rejected decisively.

Nevertheless the Holy See has acted (though whether this implies a fully conscious and considered approval of the Holy Father himself might well be moot), and there is nothing for it but to essay the experiment as prudently as possible and hope for good results.

But let us not be starryeyed. The liturgical experimentalists, having gained so much, will hardly be inclined to curb their victory and exercise that due restraint which the Sacred Congregation so trustfully anticipates. This is not mere cynicism. Liturgical innovation is the most subtle and dangerous of temptations.

To suppose that a Children's Liturgy will confine itself to a few harmless fairy stories in place of the sacred readings, or a few jovial pleasantries in place of the approved formulas, betokens innocence abroad.

If the Mass, all too often, has already been made victim of unauthorized and wholly subjective experimentation, there is every reason to fear that this further prying open the door will prove an open invitation to all manner of abuses.

And to what end? Is there honestly a popular demand for this type of liturgical adaptation? In all our comings in and goings out we have not sensed it, and we do not dwell in any ivory tower.

That a small but noisy minority of liturgical innovators have clamored for it and now exult is only too obvious, and the clamour will continue for further adaptations to suit all ages and conditions: Mass for Young Married Couples, Mass for Divorced Catholics, Mass for the Middle Aged, the Elderly, the Blind, the Halt, the Business Executive, the Union Boss, the Unemployed, the White, the Black, the Brown, the Albino.

Needless to point to the end: it will mean the erosion of all meaning from the most sacred act given to man to perform, an act which, up to the present, has been the same for all, whatever their stage or state of life.

This, by the way, suggests the canonization of M. Jean Piaget as the true successor of St. Augustine and St. Thomas as THE Doctor of the Church. Piaget, with his highly tendentious and debatable psychology of child growth and adolescence, calling for constant adaptation to mental and physical level, has thus been elevated, doubtless to his immense surprise—and possibly to his embarrassment—to the status of Adviser-in-Ordinary to the Holy See in Matters Liturgical, no less than Catechetical.

Let him take care to wear his halo at the proper angle.

Loyal to Pope

Bluntly, we emphatically regret this decision of the Holy See, and we would be less than honest not to say so. This has nothing to do with our loyalty to the Holy Father, our personal love and respect for him, and our obedience. It has much to do with our opinion of those of his advisers who, in a matter happily not connected with faith or morals, have, we are persuaded, induced him to give his name to a dangerous precedent.

It has been said, and we think with profound justice, that when an institution, be it Church or other, starts tinkering with its liturgy, it is headed for deep trouble. A rerun of the history of the Church over this past decade would seem to prove the proposition to the hilt.

The following article is taken from "Catholic Position Papers", December 1973, published by Seido Foundation, 12-6 Funado-Cho, Ashiya-Shi, Japan. We reprint this magnificent compendium of true Catholic doctrine from the *Osservatore Romano* (22/11/73).

The Eucharist and the Church of Today

I: The Sacrifice of the Mass

REV. EUGENE MORE

TO make the Catholic faith conform to the values of the contemporary world is a temptation as old as the Church itself and one that St. Paul was very much aware of when he wrote: *For I give you to understand, brethren, that gospel which was preached by me is not of man, nor was I taught it; but I received it by a revelation of Jesus Christ* (1). Today, this old temptation is still with us, its appeal strengthened by "doctrines" of unrestricted liberty in a world which is said to have "come of age"—hence the mad urge to change established liturgical forms and to give the faith an expression which is considered adapted to the mentality of our times, frequently altering its content in the process.

No one will deny that the fast changing conditions of modern life do occasionally entail modifications in liturgical rites; and that developments in explaining the faith more precisely are certainly welcome. But this is a far cry from what is happening today, when the normal channels of Church authority are ignored by those who wish to impose radical reforms in the name of an ill-defined and extremely nebulous concept of "modern man," whom they seem to regard as a totally different species. However, "modern

man," at least insofar as he is represented by the majority of Catholics, does not seem to be living up to expectations. On the contrary, many of the faithful are deeply perturbed and confused by the constant changes thrust upon them. But lacking the channels for expressing their discontent, they have little choice but to conform if they are not to abandon the faith altogether.

Nowhere is the present confusion more apparent than in ideas concerning the holy sacrifice of the Mass and the role which this central act of Christian worship should play in the lives of the faithful. Pope Paul VI, anticipating the dangers inherent in the present trends, expressed his anxiety in the encyclical *Mysterium Fidei*: "We are aware of the fact that, among those who deal with this most holy mystery in written or spoken word, there are some who spread abroad opinions that disturb the faithful and fill their minds with no little confusion about matters of faith. It is as if everyone were permitted to consign to oblivion a doctrine already defined by the Church, or else to interpret it in such a way as to weaken the genuine meaning of the words or the recognized force of the concepts involved" (2).

Follow the Magisterium

Regarding the essential character of the holy Eucharist as a mystery, and emphasizing the need for reverence and humility in approaching it, Pope Paul continues: "First of all we wish to recall something which is well known to you and altogether necessary for repelling every virus of rationalism, something to which many illustrious martyrs have witnessed with their blood, while celebrated fathers and doctors of the Church constantly professed and taught it; that is, that the Eucharist is a very great mystery. In fact, properly speaking, and to use the words of the sacred liturgy, it is the mystery of faith. Therefore, we must approach especially this mystery with humble respect, not following human arguments that should remain silent, but adhering firmly to divine revelation (and) that we should follow, as a guiding

star in our investigations of this mystery, the magisterium of the Church, to which the divine redeemer entrusted for protection and for explanation the revelation that he has communicated to us through Scripture or tradition. But this is not enough. Having safeguarded the integrity of the faith, it is necessary to safeguard also its proper mode of expression, lest, by the careless use of words, we occasion (God forbid) the rise of false opinions regarding faith in the most sublime of mysteries" (3).

Yet, in spite of this clear teaching of the Pope, the nature of the Mass as a true and real sacrifice—one and the same sacrifice as that of the cross (4)—is being questioned in some writings which tend to reduce it to a mere commemoration of the passion and death of the Lord, or to a fraternal meal in memory of the last supper. And these dangerous speculations are often reflected in the way the holy sacrifice is now being celebrated in some places of worship.

However, we are not dealing here with a question of opinion that can be left to the judgment of individual consciences. As Catholics, we are committed to a firm belief that our Lord Jesus Christ founded a Church which was to safeguard, spread, and perpetuate his revelation to men until *the consummation of the world*; (5) that this Church, by his divine will, is authorized to teach, by virtue of the apostolic succession, through a sacramentally and officially appointed hierarchy at the head of which is the Pope, Christ's vicar on earth; that, if the fact of being a Catholic has any meaning at all, the faithful (and that includes priests and theologians) must accept the teaching of this hierarchy as expressed through the Church's magisterium; and that this acceptance is not something blind and slavish, but a rational act based on faith, hope, and love for truth, which humbly acknowledges that it is impossible for the human mind alone to penetrate fully the content of the divine mysteries.

Effects of Deviations

In the case of a mystery of such vital concern to our

spiritual life as the holy Eucharist, any deviation from the teaching of the magisterium can have catastrophic effects in terms of the possible loss of God's grace, which is the only real force that enables us to do good and avoid evil. If, after almost two thousand years of Christianity, throughout which the dogma of the Eucharist has been elaborated by the greatest minds among God's friends while guided by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit working among and through the successors of the apostles; if, after all this, some men begin to doubt the Church's expression of this mystery of faith, then we can only say that they have somehow lost contact with reality. And we must add that it is the duty not only of the hierarchy but also of all Catholics who value their faith to oppose these deviations now so widespread. And this can only be done by seeking every opportunity to make clear the true Catholic teaching on the Eucharist, which can be summed up in the following points.

1. At the last supper Jesus Christ instituted the sacrifice of the Mass, offering his body and blood under the species of bread and wine, as a visible and unbloody sacrifice which anticipated the bloody sacrifice of the cross (6).

2. The sacrifice of the Mass is the same sacrifice as that of the cross, although there are accidental differences regarding the way it is offered: "We believe that the Mass celebrated by the priest, the representative of the person of Christ, in virtue of the power received by the sacrament of holy orders and offered by him in the name of Christ and of the members of his mystical body, is the sacrifice of Calvary, made sacramentally present on our altars" (7). "The sublime sacrifice of the altar is, therefore, not a mere and simple commemoration of the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, but a true and proper sacrifice by which, through an unbloody immolation, the high priest does the same thing which once he accomplished on the cross, offering himself to the eternal Father as a most acceptable victim" (8). "The priest then is the same, Jesus Christ, in whose holy person his minister acts. This minister, from the priestly consecration that he has received, is assimilated to the great high

priest, and enjoys the power of acting with the power and in the person of Christ himself. For which reason, in his priestly action, in a certain way 'he lends his tongue and supplies his hand' (St. John Chrysostom) to Christ" (9).

The new Roman missal published in 1970 expresses the exact same doctrine: "Thus, in the new missal, the *lex orandi* of the Church corresponds to her unchangeable *lex credendi*, according to which we are taught the sacrifice of the cross and its sacramental renewal in the Mass are one and the same thing, except for the different manner of offering it. Such a sacramental renewal was instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ at the last supper, when he also directed his apostles to do it in his memory. That is why the Mass is simultaneously a sacrifice of praise, thanksgiving, propitiation, and satisfaction" (10).

3. The sacrifice of the Mass perpetuates the sacrifice of the cross and realizes the work of our redemption. For, as the Second Vatican Council says: "As often as the sacrifice of the cross in which *Christ, our passover, has been sacrificed* (1 Cor. 10, 17) is celebrated on an altar, the work of our redemption is carried on" (11).

No Mere Symbolism

Related to theories which question the sacrificial nature of the Mass is the present tendency to cast doubt on the doctrine of the real presence as defined by the Church. In fact, there are some theorists who, by giving a false emphasis to the sacramental sign, would reduce the presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist to a mere symbolism, or else attempt to limit the transubstantiation to some kind of "transignification" or "transfinalization," while others would have it that Christ is present in the consecrated hosts only until the Mass has ended. All these theories are also in direct opposition to the teaching of Paul VI in *Mysterium Fidei*: "Nor is it allowable to discuss the mystery of transubstantiation without mentioning what the Council of Trent stated about the marvellous conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body and the whole substance of the wine into the

blood of Christ . . . or to propose or act upon the opinion according to which, in the consecrated hosts which remain after the celebration of the Mass, Christ our Lord is no longer present" (12).

Faced with all these diverse errors, the committed Catholic will gladly follow the directions of the Holy See and affirm that the conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body and the whole substance of the wine into his blood, a conversion that Catholic dogma defines as transubstantiation, causes Jesus Christ to be really and truly present, body and blood, soul and divinity, under the species of the bread and equally under the species of the wine, and in every part of both species; and that Jesus Christ, true God and true man, remains really and substantially present in the eucharistic species which are conserved after the Mass has been celebrated (13).

The new Roman missal again shows how the liturgy is in perfect conformity with the faith: "The wonderful mystery of the Lord's real presence under the eucharistic species . . . confirmed in the celebration of the Mass, is shown not only in the very wonder of consecration by which it is rendered present through transubstantiation, but also by the sense and display of the highest reverence and adoration that takes place in the liturgy of the Eucharist" (14).

Other Deviations

Another departure from the Church's teaching is seen in the way some proponents of radical reform deny any value to Masses not attended by the people, as if this were a deviation from authentic Christian rite. Yet, when we turn to *Mysterium Fidei*, we find the Holy Father categorically declaring the opposite: ". . . it is not allowable to emphasize what is called the 'communal' Mass to the disparagement of Masses celebrated in private" (15). And in a later section of the same encyclical Pope Paul says: "For even though a priest should offer Mass in private, that Mass is not something private; it is an act of Christ and of the Church. In

offering this sacrifice the Church learns to offer herself as a sacrifice for all. Moreover, she applies the single, boundless redemptive power of the sacrifice of the cross for the salvation of the whole world. Hence, although the very nature of the celebration renders most appropriate the active participation of many of the faithful, nevertheless, that Mass is to be fully approved which, in conformity with the prescriptions and lawful traditions of the Church, a priest for sufficient reason offers in private, that is, in the presence of no one except his server" (16).

Finally, in contradiction to the doctrine of faith concerning the nature of the sacrifice of the Mass, one sometimes hears or reads opinions to the effect that the faithful take part in the Mass in the same way as the priest, as if the minister and the congregation were concelebrating; or that all present offer the victim in the same way; or that the priest is simply the president or representative of the assembly offering the Eucharist. Such attempts to equate the common priesthood of the faithful with the ministerial priesthood in no way reflect the mind of the Fathers of Vatican II when, in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, they referred to the participation of the faithful in the one priesthood of Christ after first making it clear that the ministerial priesthood differs from it not only in degree but also in essence (17).

As Pius XII had said previously in *Mediator Dei*: "That Christians offer the sacrifice through the hands of the priest is clear from the fact that the minister of the altar acts in the person of Christ as head of the mystical body, offering in the name of all his members. Wherefore, the whole Church can properly be said to offer the victim through Christ. That the people offer together with the priest is not based on the fact that, being members of the Church no less than the priest himself, they perform a visible liturgical rite, for this privilege is reserved to the priest divinely appointed to this office; but rather it is based on the fact that they join their prayers of praise, petition, expiation, and thanksgiving with the prayers or intention of the priest,

indeed of the great high priest himself, to the end that they be offered to God in the very oblation of the victim and also in the external rite of the priest" (18). The selfsame teaching is given by Vatican II: "The ministerial priest by the sacred power he enjoys teaches and rules the priestly people. Acting in the person of Christ, he brings about the eucharistic sacrifice, and offers it to God in the name of all the people. For their part, the faithful join in the offering of the Eucharist by virtue of their royal priesthood. They likewise exercise that priesthood by receiving the sacraments, by prayer and thanksgiving, by the witness of a holy life, and by self-denial and active charity" (19).

(*To be concluded*)

Changes in the Mass

An expansion in pamphlet form of the articles by Michael Davies which appeared in *Christian Order* for November and December, 1974.

Published by the author and obtainable from him

at

46, Blacklands Road, London SE6 3AF.

10p per single copy (post free)

40p per six copies (post free)

£1.00 per fifteen copies (post free)

When the opportune moment arrives a clash of Communist Giants may well take place in Africa. One aspect of the build-up of both against that day is outlined below. It tells only part of the story, but is well worth noting.

Marxist Bridgeheads in Africa

CZESLAW JESMAN

AT the moment of writing (which is some months ago) there are two States in Africa which have adopted Marxism as the basis of their political systems. The People's Republic of the Congo and the Somali Democratic Republic are, in theory at least, as much "People's Republics" as any member of the Warsaw Pact or, for that matter, Cuba. As such, they can be considered quite properly as Marxist bridgeheads in sub-Saharan Africa even though, owing to their geographical position, they cannot be thought of as responding to Mr. Brezhnev's doctrine of limited sovereignty (which makes the interests of the Soviet Union paramount) as automatically as the Warsaw Pact countries of Eastern Europe.

On their own, these two countries are of little economic or political account. The People's Republic of the Congo (Congo Brazzaville) is a tiny entity, judged by African standards, with a population of less than one and a half million people. The Somali Democratic Republic is much larger and has a population of some three million tribesmen, most of whom are nomads deeply attached to their traditional tribal way of life. This continues, even though, in Somalia today, "tribalism" is considered as a crime against the State. One need hardly say, *en passant*, that the exact meaning attached to this term by government officials is vague and

variable: it is applied as a rule to all overt enemies of the existing system in that country.

Marxism was established in Somalia by a coup, which was in deliberate imitation of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. The Somali Democratic Republic was proclaimed after a military take-over on October 21st, 1969: on that occasion power was seized by the Supreme Revolutionary Council. Its President is Major General Muhammad Siyah Barreh, a one-time warrant officer in the Italian Colonial Army. He is now a virtual dictator, though, in theory, he is no more than Chairman of a fourteen-strong "collective leadership". There is, in the Somali Democratic Republic, a National Security Court dealing, by way of sole and final tribunal, with all cases involving the security of the Republic. It is closely connected with various branches of the Government.

Only in religious matters has the Soviet example not been followed in Somalia. The reason is understandable. The country is aggressively Muslim and, last year, was admitted as a sort of honorary member to the Arab League. The discrepancy found in the coexistence of the country's ideological creed of Marxist dialectical materialism and its Muslim religion has been explained by the President somewhat disingenuously. In other countries, he explained, the ministers of various religious creeds had oppressed the people. This was not, however, the case in Somalia, which had remained, in consequence, staunchly Muslim. This, of course, has not prevented its armed forces from being totally rearmed, retrained and reorganised by the Soviet Union and with Soviet instructors. The army of the Somali Democratic Republic is made up of some 12,000 men under arms and in various formations, including four tank battalions. The Air Force consists of some 20 MIG's of the obsolescent "17" and "15" varieties. In itself, the Somali Army is hardly a formidable force, but some 500 of its officers have been trained in the Soviet Union and the number of Soviet instructors in the country is roughly the same. The ports of Berbera in the North and Kisimayu in

the South have been expanded beyond the wildest needs of the token Somali Navy, which consists of 6 ocean-going MTB's, half of which only are sea-worthy at any particular moment.

A similar situation obtains in the People's Republic of the Congo. It disposes of 5 transport planes and only one helicopter; but it keeps operational two major bases at Maya-Maya and Pointe Noire, and 22 lesser airfields in other parts of the country. The armed forces of the country consist of one infantry battalion; but a para-commando unit of more than two thousand men is an ample deterrent to any opposition liable to be put up by "tribalist" enemies of the governing Party of Labour. The Chairman of the Central Committee of the Governing Party is Major Marien Ngouabi, who is also the country's President and Commander-in-Chief. In the People's Republic of the Congo the Soviet presence is much less in evidence than in the Somali Democratic Republic. In both countries it is, as a matter of fact, somewhat muted and it is representatives of the Warsaw Pact Countries who are making the running in both countries with economic and technical projects. Poles, Czechs, Hungarians and Rumanians are engaged, somewhat half-heartedly, in a variety of development plans in both countries: in the Congo, for example, 130 Polish technicians are building an oil refinery near Pointe Noire. Neither are either of these African Soviet-Marxist States given any undue coverage in the mass media of the Warsaw Pact countries.

The Red Chinese drive in Africa, on the other hand, is gathering momentum. The Somali Democratic Republic has recently signed a medical agreement with Peking, whilst 40 Chinese road-construction engineers and 21 doctors arrived in neighbouring Ethiopia in April of last year and, the following May, a two-year agreement to train Ethiopians in bamboo-weaving was signed by the Chinese Ambassador in Addis Ababa. Further down the coast of East Africa, Tanzania hotly denied last year that it had offered naval facilities to China. Nevertheless, on April 1st, 1974 China

agreed to provide Tanzania with an interest-free loan of 525m. shillings, whilst the first Chinese-built train reached a Zambian town on the Tanzam railway a week later. There are at present and at the very least, 17,000 Chinese workmen and specialists of various kinds in Tanzania. The bulk of them, obviously, are on the railway. In the People's Republic of the Congo, Chinese influence is once more on the increase. Jean Jules Okabando, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Congolese Youth and heir presumptive to Ngouabi, recently received Lu Chih-hsien, the Chinese Ambassador, *before* he saw Afanasenko, his Soviet colleague. Radio Brazzaville was at pains to stress the precedence.

It would appear that both Communist Great Powers are cautiously glad of the existence of Marxist bases in Africa and are endeavouring to spread their influence in these countries where they already have some roots. Yet, as long as the world situation remains more or less static, they must be presumed to be trying in the main to prepare the ground for a sudden and well co-ordinated burst of activity whenever the opportune moment arrives. Far from being written off by Moscow and Peking, Africa is being carefully nursed and indoctrinated—whilst comparative peace lasts and the Suez Canal remains closed—as a future battleground for a geographically remote, but very important head-on clash between the Soviet Union and China. And it is important to notice that the West does not enter into these plans of the two Communist Giants. The Russians and the Chinese are agreed on this point at least—in Africa the Western Powers and ex-Powers are no more than so many paper dragons.

It is a great pleasure to publish the address given by Australia's outstanding Catholic layman as part of a seminar on "Population and Environment" at the Fortieth International Eucharistic Congress held at Melbourne. The opinions expressed in this paper deserve the thoughtful consideration of readers.

Philosophies in Collision: 1

B. A. SANTAMARIA

AS the decade of the seventies moves towards its middle years, there are three philosophies contending for mastery over the mind of Western man. Where once battles of ideas were initially confined within the academic cloister, to make their impact on the masses only at half a century's remove, to a large extent the contemporary battle is immediate, television bringing its wider manifestations into every home. In my view, the idea is ultimately the determinant. The struggle in the field of ideas is ultimately a struggle for mastery over the Western world.

The three philosophies may be broadly described as the libertarian (or secular humanist), the totalitarian (or the Marxist), the Christian (or more broadly, the religious).

- (1) The libertarian philosophy is more commonly known as the philosophy of secular humanism, as distinct from that of Christian humanism, and, if one may split hairs even more finely, of liberal humanism. Its method is to bring about a massive change in the climate of public opinion, mainly through the influence of its devotees in the education system and the media (above all in the field of television), and thus to create an atmosphere so overwhelming on issues like population control, abortion, censorship, that no political party feels it politically possible

to confront it. In this context, television will be as revolutionary as the automobile has been. The invention of the automobile dissolved the compact city, created the sprawling suburbs. The invention of television dissolves established beliefs and attitudes, without discrimination between those which are right and those which are wrong.

- (2) The totalitarian (or for practical purposes the Communist) philosophy has a different method. For it, mastery involves the use of physical, military, political methods in order to control the State and through the coercive power of government to impose on the people, conformity with historical materialism, and its practical derivatives.
- (3) The Christian (or more generally the religious) philosophy has a familiar content. Its method is internal change in the hearts of men; and external change through the "presence" of committed Christians in all the institutions of society. In democratic societies these include government, administration, political parties, trade unions, universities, media, and the rest.

The Periphery of the Conflict

Between these three philosophies contending for the mastery of the world there are, of course, persons and currents of ideas which have not fully accepted the one or the other.

The persons will sometimes call themselves humanists. These may have a different attitude from the Christian, for instance, on the question of abortion. Yet they are not by any means committed to the ideology of secular humanism as a complete and finished system. Theirs is rather a set of personal, often compassionate, reactions to the injustices and hardships of life. With them there is no collision: it is possible to reason, to compromise, in search of practical objectives.

As for the currents of ideas, one may choose the example of liberal democracy or liberal humanism (to establish a distinction from secular humanism), as it is in the contemporary world. Historically, liberal democracy did not originate in Christianity. It originated in the Enlightenment, which preceded and accompanied the French Revolution. Avoidably or otherwise, it was born into conflict with Christianity. Yet, whatever the theoretical differences between the liberal democrat and the Christian on moral and religious issues today, there are in fact wide areas of agreement, practical assumptions held, and practical objectives to be pursued, in common.

The liberal democrat—including writers like Kristol, Beichmann and others in the United States—may be atheist or agnostic or hold different views from the Christian on issues of personal morality. Yet on purely sociological grounds, extremely different from those of the Christian, he can recognise the centrality of the family institution and the significance of the sacred in the maintenance of a human society. He is often the most committed and redoubtable foe of totalitarianism.

Over large areas of the conflict which rends modern Western communities, the liberal democrat is the indispensable ally of the Christian in the struggle for a human world and against “dehumanisation”.

But between the three main philosophies themselves however—the religious, the secular humanist, the totalitarian—there will never be any compromise until they cease to be what they are. They have totally different views of man. They aim to create totally different human societies. And we do no service to anyone by presenting the matter differently.

The problem between them is radical: that is, it goes to the roots.

This is not to be wondered at, since the three forces which are in collision are sometimes said to be all, in essence, religious. It is a paradoxical term to apply to two of them, whose central aim is to eliminate religion as a formative

influence in human society, regarding it respectively as an instrument of the capitalist order or as an obscurantist relic of a pre-scientific age. Yet they each *do* have a body of doctrine which claims to interpret the riddle of human existence. They each *do* command the dedicated allegiance of a numerically small but operationally sufficiently large body of followers. They each *do* have an international organisation which maximises their effectiveness.

A.

My purpose is to examine the types of world order proposed by these three forces, and to enquire into a few of the moral, legal and political principles and consequences involved in the struggle between them.

Let me quickly sum up the essential parts of their world view.

(1) *The Totalitarian Challenge*

This totalitarian challenge has been dealt with frequently in the past. It need be mentioned only briefly in passing, on the one hand for the sake of completeness, on the other because those who have graduated from secondary or tertiary institutions over the past ten years have little or no knowledge of totalitarian practice and little enough of totalitarian philosophy.

There is no excuse for any failure to understand that the totalitarian philosophy is in direct collision with the religious view of life and of the world. In its Marxist form, which is the only one with which we are seriously confronted, historical materialism is the compulsory doctrine; the Party is the Church; there is no separation between that Church and the State; the Party uses the military, the police, the concentration camp and the psychiatric ward, the economic, the propaganda and the educational powers of the State to impose its one monolithic philosophy on young and old alike. This compulsory conformity to one philosophy, enforced by the State, is the thing which distinguishes the

Communist State from the more ordinary type of authoritarian government, be it in Spain or in the military dictatorships of S.E. Asia. They *are* authoritarian, and unpalatable to the democrat. Within them, however, there is no one uniform compulsory philosophy enforced by the power of the State. There is a qualified, but still definite, freedom for the family, for trade unions and other economic institutions, for religion, and in some cases for other political parties.

It is only incidental to this main point to draw attention to three practical realities.

- (1) There is no country in the world, in which the Communists have finally won, in which they are ready to share political power with the Socialists or the Catholic Progressives who, in Chile, France, Italy, in different ways and to different degrees, collaborate with the Marxists.
- (2) There is no country in the world in which they have not betrayed the religious leaders who helped them, as Hromadka found to his cost after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.
- (3) With the exception of Poland, where the Church has fought grimly and successfully for its rights, there is no country in which the totalitarians have complete power, in which full and publicly committed Christians are not isolated like Solzhenitsyn, legally restrained like the Russian Orthodox Archbishop Yermogen of Kaluga, sent to the psychiatric ward or the concentration camp, like the Russian Baptists, the Catholic Uniates of the Ukraine, like a Cardinal Slipyj, or a Cardinal Mindszenty.

There should be no need to remind the Catholic that it is impossible to reach accommodation with totalitarianism. The injunctions of Pius XI in relation to Nazism and to Communism are sometimes dismissed as relating to another age. They were right when they were written and they remain right today.

That Catholicism and Marxism cannot be reconciled as ideological systems has been stated by every Pope from Pius

XI to Paul VI. That incompatibility is not merely theoretical. It has practical consequences in relation to freedom of religious belief and expression, which it has become fashionable to forget. One part of the Catholic intelligentsia appears to believe that Maoism is the most perfect form of 20th century Christianity—a strange belief which would surprise no one more than the redoubtable Chairman himself.

It is extremely questionable whether one should seek diplomatic accommodation with the gaolers over the bodies of those who languish in psychiatric wards or concentration camps. The International Committee for the Defence of Human Rights in the Soviet Union (whose findings were presented by Professor P. Reddaway of the London School of Economics) reports that in 1973 one million prisoners were being detained in inhuman conditions in Soviet concentration camps — in the post-Stalin era!* The Soviet nuclear physicist, Sakharov, is only one of the Russian liberals who constantly aver that the silence of the West, undertaken in the name of accommodation, simply makes it easier for the Soviet regime to persecute its victims and adds terribly to their sufferings.

Nor is there any real evidence that diplomatic accommodation pays in the sense of mitigating the sufferings of believers, or laying the foundations of a future accord. What have the policies of "dialogue" or of diplomatic accommodation achieved to balance the confusion and disintegration of the Christian forces throughout the world, to which they have undoubtedly contributed? The Jews, on the other hand, have resisted the Soviets with world-wide organisation: and the Soviets have had no alternative but to yield to their major demands.

Having briefly mentioned these essential facts, I pass to the libertarian challenge, which is at the heart of the debate over population and ecology.

i) The Libertarian Challenge

The libertarian forces are equally in collision with the

*Melbourne Age, 28.2.73.

religious world view. One aspect of their philosophy, but one only, is what is popularly known as "permissiveness". As Mr. Justice Megarry has pointed out, this amounts to an assertion on the part of its devotees "that they can do what they like".*

In a discussion which is directed primarily to the problem of world population and resources, it is necessary to confine this critique of the libertarian philosophy to the current challenges to the institution of the family and the traditional norms of sexual morality.

It can therefore be noted only in passing that, on a deeper understanding, the libertarian philosophy presents a radical challenge to the assumptions of the civilisation we have inherited. Whether or not that challenge is justified, it is important to understand its real nature.

In a discussion of what some regard as the disintegration of contemporary American society, the London *Economist* raised this searching question:

"It cannot be ruled out that the trouble in America goes so deep that the Americans may be incapable of running a coherent foreign policy for years to come. The United States may be experiencing something that no other country has yet had to go through. It may be experiencing the first full flowering of the Protestant revolution. What happened in the 16th century was the rebirth of an idea that had long lain dormant; the idea that the responsibility of the individual is the ultimate criterion of both politics and religion. The rebirth of that idea changed the face of Europe; among other things, it made democracy possible on a scale larger than that of the Greek city-state. But its full impact was never felt by the majority of people. It remained largely a concept of the educated. It is possible that the United States, which has been the first country to do so many things, and was the first to bring material plenty to most of its people, is now the first country to face the consequences of the fact that widespread

* Australian Law Institute Journal, November 1972.

prosperity universalises the revolution of individualism. If that is the explanation of what is happening to America, the place could be almost ungovernable for a very long time: it could be living through the first onset of the war of all against all. The rest of us had better wave the Americans goodbye while we wait for the same cataclysm to hit us in our turn.”*

What the *Economist* calls “the revolution of individualism” affects the whole of modern life. It should therefore be considered against a far wider context than the institution of the family or the traditional norms of sexual morality. It is much more than “permissiveness”. It challenges the very foundations of society.

It has arisen by reaction against the phenomenon of “bigness” which pervades the whole of modern Western industrial society. The dominant characteristic of modern industrial society is size: big government, big business, big unionism, big cities. The main characteristic of a society which places a premium on size is bureaucracy: and there is no factor more effective than giant bureaucracy in dissolving authority.

In her work, *On Violence*, Hannah Arendt finds the source of the contemporary tactics of “confrontation”, whose ultimate effects on the structure of the modern State cannot yet be foreseen, in all-pervading bureaucracy. She writes:

“In a fully developed bureaucracy there is nobody left with whom one can argue, to whom one can present grievances, on whom pressures of power can be exerted. Bureaucracy is the form of government in which everyone is deprived of political freedom, of the power to act; for the rule of Nobody is not no-rule, but where all are equally powerless we have a tyranny without a tyrant.”

It is within the context of this more general challenge that we must examine the impact of the libertarian philosophy on controverted issues like population, resources, the role of the family, the traditional norms of sexual

* *The Economist*, 6 November, 1971.

morality.

Let me hasten to say that the real doctrinaires are only the tiny minorities in the Humanist Societies and certain closely affiliated organisations. In one sense there is nothing new about them. They are simply a new model of the old Rationalist groups. Two new factors, however, have given them an incomparably greater significance. The first is television, which gives their value-structure (as visibly present in capitalist advertising as it is in explicitly "permissive" propaganda) a universal expression into ordinary homes. The second is the contemporary methods of contraception which (whatever their ultimate medical consequences) make it technically far more possible to separate sex as a mechanism from procreation as a function.

In a very real sense television and contraception contribute the technical origins of the revolution which has come about in contemporary attitudes to family and sexual morality.

The closest approximation among the secular humanists to a complete ideological system seems to be in the movement entitled "Zero Population Growth". (In this regard, may I emphasise that in criticising the philosophy of Z.P.G. I am not denying what in fact I believe, the need to control fertility by means which are both morally and biologically permissible.)

The doctrines of Z.P.G. do hang together cohesively. Its premise appears to be that the supreme purpose of human activity is to maintain the ecological balance as they interpret it. Against that interpretation the human being has no unqualified rights. While this position has been justified on the ground that it seeks the best possible condition for humanity as a whole, the claim to curtail all human rights for a higher good was essentially Hitler's and Stalin's justification.

By any normal understanding, the characteristic positions which secular humanism projects into the education system and the media represent an inversion of normality.

"Pregnancy", wrote Dr. Ehrlich, in what seems to me

to be a blasphemous inversion of truth, "is a nine-month disease".* It is this which justifies the statement of the Jesuit theologian, Fr. Schall, that this is "the first generation in the history of mankind which is being told that the child itself is the evil, and a menace to the human race. This" he rightly says, "is the ultimate perversion".

From this assumption, what follows is merely logical.

- (1) Among the secular humanist groups, the devotees of Z.P.G. have urged that State power can be used against those who have more than what a government decides to be the maximum desirable number of children.
- (2) It is because of their fundamental assumption that the foetus has no unqualified rights that the libertarians see no difficulty in campaigning for abortion on demand.
- (3) Because population control is essential to the ecological balance; and because the Pill makes a sufficient proportion of its users ill or otherwise so incommodes them that it cannot be relied upon as the sole method of population control, vasectomy or sterilisation is not merely legitimate but praiseworthy, and sterilisation programmes have a legitimate claim on public funds.
- (4) Since sex as a mechanism is to be completely separable from procreation as a function, homosexuality can logically be regarded as a normal and merely different human form of sexual expression for those with different physical requirements.
- (5) Since sex as a mechanism is not merely to be completely separated from procreation as a function, but even from human love as its emotional context, it becomes instead a morally neutral mechanism for immediate sensate pleasure—even for those who find pleasure in sadism and brutality. Some favourable reviewers of Marlon Brando's new film "Last Tango in Paris" have proposed that its "honesty" in de-

* Quoted by A. Chisholm in *Philosophers of the Earth*, p. 148.

picting sadism is among its main virtues. As one unfavourable reviewer has commented on this position, a woman is no longer an object of adoration but "a hunk of meat".

- (6) Literature and films whose primary purpose is to maximise profits by stimulating the "eros" and making it ungovernable, present no moral problem but merely serve the positive purpose of creating new forms of sensate pleasure. Therefore the censorship of pornography is both purposeless and tyrannical.

It is undeniable that these positions are proposed with constantly increasing pressure to the mind of our age. No viewer of current affairs programmes in Australian television would deny that in the past year they have occupied an inordinate amount of programme time.

For the purpose of this paper, I make no moral judgment whatsoever on any of these positions.

(As a private person, I have a moral judgment, which is the traditional Christian judgment. As a Catholic, in those cases where the "magisterium" has ruled, I have no logical alternative but to accept its rulings.)

If I do not introduce a moral judgment in this paper, it is for the practical reason that, however much Christians may delude themselves, there are no commonly accepted moral norms in contemporary Western society. It would be pointless for Lord Devlin today to claim that the law may justly enforce commonly held moral standards. There are none. (At a later stage, I will discuss the proper limits of law in this field.)

I judge these characteristic libertarian positions simply by their social consequences; this is the practical criterion set by the secular humanist himself.

Do they contribute to a human order in this world, whatever they may do in relation to another world?

Certain contemporary situations are undeniably the consequence of the spread of libertarian ideology.

- (a) There are said to be 9 million children in the United

States brought up by one parent only, because the family unit has been broken by divorce. No moral judgment, only a practical one. What kind of human existence is offered to these helpless victims? What kind of human existence can they offer to their own offspring?

- (b) Abortion is now accepted by the Statute law of Britain and South Australia, as well as that of many other countries, democratic and Communist, Occidental and Oriental; and even by the Common Law as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States. In Britain in 1972, there were 150,000 legal abortions, of which two-thirds were performed in private clinics at an average fee of 300 pounds stg.—surely a major growth industry. In the State of New York alone, in 1971, there were 215,000.

In South Australia, the proportion of abortions to live births was higher than in Britain. The hypocrisy of the original sob-story — that abortion ought to be made legal to save the life of the mother, threatened by the marauding presence of the foetus — is fully exposed by the South Australian figures for 1972, which show that 21 per cent of all abortions were on school girls.¹ In Washington State during 1971, more than 33 per cent of the 14,000 legal abortions were performed on teenagers.²

It is sometimes claimed that there has not been a "Sexual Revolution". Perhaps not. But in the matter of abortion there has certainly been a legal revolution. And as most ordinary citizens tend to believe that what is legal is also moral, the revolution must inevitably extend far beyond the bounds of legal concepts. No moral judgment, only a practical one. Is the elimination of millions of unborn children

1. Melbourne *Herald*, 5.2.73.

2. Melbourne *Advocate*, 1.2.73.

every year an acceptable human order.³

- (c) Pre-marital sexual relations, if not yet the norm, are advertised as part of the new "life-style" and any opposing force is dismissed as antediluvian. There is in consequence a world-wide plague of venereal disease. In Britain, in 1949, at the time of the post-war peak, 116,400 men and women suffering from venereal disease presented themselves to clinics. In 1971, the total for both sexes was multiplied two-and-a-half times and reached 307,600.⁴ Yet according to the World Health Organisation, the incidence of gonorrhea in the United States was, in 1971, more than twice as high as in Britain while in Sweden it was three-and-a-half times as high.⁵ No moral judgment, only a practical one. Is this, too, part of an acceptable human order?

To debate the issues in terms of abstract human rights, regardless of the consequences of their exercise, is the sport of one brand of intellectual. More sensible humans will examine the consequences of ideas in practice before passing judgment on their value.

For those who do not believe that any moral question is involved, two other problems still remain.

- (1) There is the "aesthetic" problem to which I have already adverted. Without considering any next

3. Since the above was written, the London-based Foundation for Education and Research in Childbearing (whose chief trustee is Sir John Peel, formerly President of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists) has reported the following consequences of the liberalisation of abortion. (*Melbourne Age*, 3.3.73).

* A doubling of perinatal mortality rates (stillbirths and deaths in the first week of life) following the liberalisation of abortion.

* A 40 per cent increase in premature births.

* A 100 to 150 per cent increase in extrauterine pregnancies (highly dangerous for the mother and usually fatal for the child).

* A fourfold increase in pelvic inflammatory conditions, menstrual and other disorders, and

* An increase in sterility.

The report noted that in the six years following liberalisation of abortion in Japan, the number of births fell by 37 per cent, while the infant death rate from congenital malformations rose by 43 per cent.

The number of abortions aimed at reducing the number of handicapped children is very small compared with the number of abortions likely to increase the prevalence of handicap.

4. *The Economist*, 3.2.73.

5. *The Economist*, 3.2.73.

world, whose existence the libertarians deny, is this the type of society in which we want to live in this world? The question is not asked from the viewpoint of morality, but from the viewpoint of human living, the criterion explicitly set by the humanists themselves.

- (2) Secondly, and even more practically, is the community automatically to be expected to pay the inevitable financial costs of the libertarian society?

The question was posed by Mr. Justice Megarry of the English High Court of Justice in his fifth Riddell Lecture in 1972. He indicated that this society, sometimes called "permissive", more accurately called "libertarian", involves not merely a claim for absolute rights but also a "demand for facilities". His own words are more exact than mine:

"There is (said to be) the 'right' to take drugs. This is balanced by the duties of others to provide or make it possible to obtain the drugs, and the duties of doctors and lawyers to lend their aid when the taking of drugs has got out of hand.

"There is the 'right' to freedom of sexual intercourse. This is balanced by the duty of society, through clinics and hospitals, to provide the treatment for venereal diseases and the termination of pregnancies that are so often required.

"There is the 'right' to contract out of the world and belong to the 'alternative society'. That is balanced by the duty of the rest of the world to make this possible, to provide the means for the permissionists to live on their own and do what they want, with recourse to all the food and all the medical, dental, legal and other services which the 'alternative society' does not and cannot provide."*

It raises very serious questions of economic cost and social priorities.

There is a definite upper limit to the proportion of the Gross National Product governments can take in taxation without precipitating a far more rampant inflation than to-

day's. The "claim for facilities" is that it is right and necessary to spend public funds raised by taxation on abortion clinics and V.D. clinics and similar "social services". But this, of course, simply means that there is less to be spent on deserted wives, on widows, on abandoned old people; that is to say, less to spend on genuinely distressed humanity. It is not a moral but a social question to determine whether these are really the correct priorities in the expenditure of limited public funds.

In my view, to take public funds from the genuinely poor and distressed and to devote them to the devotees of the libertarian "life-style", is a particularly shabby form of theft.

(In parenthesis, may I pay a professional tribute to the media for having sold this "bill of goods" to so many women in the name of Women's Liberation. It is very doubtful whether women have really been liberated from male dominance by the Pill and the abortion clinic. Liberation seems to me to have come much more fully to the male, our wandering Casanovas, who no longer need fear the "shotgun wedding" or the maintenance order. They are now entitled to expect that their more-or-less willing victim will have got the Pill on the National Health. If she was silly enough to be "careless", to use their jargon, they can refer her to a newly-legal abortion clinic. *She* is not liberated from the inconveniences of the Pill, or the trauma of abortion. But who can deny that *his* liberation is complete?)

(To be concluded)

Thought for Lent

I'd rather miss three meals than a single copy of *Christian Order!* — American Reader.

In response to requests, Father Crane has expanded into a short series of articles the address entitled "The Church and the World" which he gave under the auspices of Pro Fide at the Caxton Hall, London on October 15th, 1974. The first article in the series is published this month.

CURRENT COMMENT

The Church and the World

I: Christ and the Devil

THE EDITOR

CHRISt Our Lord never sought the acceptance of men on their terms. He would be accepted by them only to the extent that they accepted the truth on his terms. One would expect this, for he was God as well as man and God's truth, precisely because it is God's truth, must be perfect. Were it not, God would not be God. His truth, then, is something to be received by men, not made by them in their image by means of majority vote; still less to be altered by God or tampered with in any way to make it more palatable. It was, then, God's truth whole and entire that Christ Our Lord brought to men. There could be no watering down where it was concerned. Clear evidence of this was given at the very outset of his public life. You know the story. It is worth recalling here for, like everything else in the Gospels, it is meant for us and for all men always.

Christ Confronts the Devil

After his baptism by John the Baptist, at the very outset of his public life, Christ Our Lord was led by the Spirit into the wilderness of scrub and rock and sand to be tempted by the Devil. There is a point here that is worth a

pause at this juncture and, indeed, later on. It is that Our Lord went to confront the Devil; not to carry out a sociological survey, as a good many progressive advocates of what is now called the "social gospel" would probably have him do, not to brood on the eschatological significance of desert-living, nor, indeed, to study desert life-styles; still less to investigate the relevance of desert structures with a view to calling for the abolition of those considered oppressive; neither did he carry plans with him for reclaiming the desert or for the formation of communes that might engage in this work of reclamation. Christ did none of these things; none of the things that trendies in the contemporary Church would advocate today *as of first priority*. He went instead, at the outset of his public life, to face the Devil and be subjected by him to a three-phased temptation, showing, thereby, his primary preoccupation with *spiritual* evil, as distinct from its social manifestations. It was from sin and Hell that he came primarily and essentially to liberate us, not oppressive social structures. The Holy Father reminded the assembled bishops of this fact in his closing address to the Synod. "Human liberation", he said, "has been rightly emphasised. It forms part of that love which Christians owe to their brethren. But the totality of salvation is not to be confused with one or other aspect of liberation, and the Good News must preserve all of its own originality; that of a God who saves us from sin and death and brings us to divine life. Hence, human advancement, social progress, etc., is not to be excessively emphasised on a temporal level to the detriment of the essential meaning which evangelization has for the Church of Christ: the announcement of the Good News". (*L'Osservatore Romano*, English Edition, for Nov. 7th, 1974)

A World in Satan's Grip

It is the third and last phase of that encounter between Christ and the Devil that I would like to concentrate on here, for the temptation it contained was in the shape of an

invitation to Christ to lower his standards in order that his message, which contained God's truth, might be made more acceptable to the men of his time, "modern man", as we call him today.

The Devil, we are told, in the third temptation took Christ to the top of a high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the then known world. They were all his, he told Christ, and he would give them all to him if, kneeling down, Christ would adore him. There was, of course, no call here to idolatry or devil-worship. The form of words used gives this impression today; but their substance, which Christ at once understood, adds up to a subtle enough suggestion, playing on the best in Christ's nature, his passionate zeal for souls, that he should suit his truth, which was God's, accommodate his standards to the men of his day in order the more easily to win them to himself. The temptation was immensely powerful not only because of its appeal to the best that was in Christ, but because of the state of the world to which Christ came. For the men of the kingdoms that composed that known world were, indeed, in Satan's hands, as the Devil was quick to point out to Christ at the outset of the third and final temptation. And why was this so? Because they belonged to a race as yet unredeemed; without Grace, that is; incapable, therefore, of keeping the whole of God's law for a short time or part of it for a long time by their own unaided efforts; a prey, in other words, to the enslaving corruption of sin. St. Paul gives us a thumb-nail sketch of what these men were like in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans:

"And as they scorned to keep God in their view, so God has abandoned them to a frame of mind worthy of all scorn, that prompts them to disgraceful acts. They are versed in every kind of injustice, knavery, impurity, avarice, and ill-will; spiteful, murderous, contentious, deceitful, depraved, backbiters, slanderers, God's enemies; insolent, haughty; vainglorious; inventive in wickedness, disobedient to their parents; without prudence, without honour, without love, without

loyalty, without pity. Yet, with the just decrees of God before their minds, they never grasped the truth that those who so live are deserving of death; not only those who commit such acts, but those who countenance such a manner of living." (vv.28-33)

Their post-Christian counterparts of today you will find in the *Dolce Vita*, administering the beastliness of Belsen or Solzhenitsyn's Gulag Archipelago or as personified in the supporters of Manchester United when well and truly on the rampage. All are no more than varied outward expressions of the inner rottenness that now besets our post-Christian and pagan world.

The Temptation to Suit Truth to Modern Man

So this, then, was the temptation presented by the Devil to Christ at the outset of his public life and aimed, as I have said, at his finest instinct—suit your message to meet the mood of modern man, make obeisance to me in this sense, that you lower your standards to meet half-way the values of what is, in effect, my world; do this and all the kingdoms of that world, with their inhabitants, will be yours for the taking. What an appeal! What a prize held out before Christ! Just cut down a little, rub away the hard edges from your teaching and the whole known world will be no longer mine but yours: bend a little to meet human weakness, soften the toughness of your message, make it acceptable to the men of this age and they will be at your feet.

Christ's reaction was instantaneous. He told the Devil to go. There could be no compromise, no watering down of his teaching. It was the whole of his truth or nothing that he was to give mankind. It had to be because, as I have said already, it was God's truth that he was to bring to men and he was God. Where God's truth was concerned there could be no compromise, no accommodation to the supposed needs of modern man, a figure always with us because, when you come to analyze him, he is no more than contemporary man of each succeeding age.

The Same Today

As with Christ in his day, so with his Church in ours. The temptation is exactly the same—with this difference, that many in the Church have fallen for it, urging the Church to suit not merely the form, but the substance of Christ's message to embrace supposed contemporary needs. Her doctrine is too hard, they say, too old-fashioned; let her bend it in order that men may find it acceptable. It is the substance of God's truth that is at stake here; but in this there can be no yielding. Not one iota can be given up for, once again, what is at stake is God's truth which is perfect, with the result that, where it is concerned, there can be no give. The Church which guards that truth must remain utterly faithful to that truth if she is to remain faithful to the mandate entrusted to her by her founder, Jesus Christ. It follows that we who are members of the Church must also remain totally faithful if we are to be worthy of Jesus Christ. If there is point, then, to this meeting tonight, it is to proclaim together our absolute loyalty to God's truth, as given by Christ to his Church, and to the teaching authority of that Church at whose head stands our Holy Father the Pope, the Vicar of Christ on Earth. "By virtue of his office", said the second Vatican Council, "that is, as Vicar and Pastor of the whole Church, he has full, supreme and universal power in the Church. And he can always exercise this power freely". (*Lumen Gentium*, 22).

We are Called Divisive

Today, strangely enough, for proclaiming our loyalty in these terms we are called by the Progressives in our midst and, it would seem, by way of reproach, "divisive". The answer is that, as Catholics, we must be proudly and unashamedly divisive in that, holding, as we must, to the truth of God, which Christ gave over to the keeping of his Church, we are necessarily divided, thereby, from those

within the Church today who, seeking the acceptance of the world, would lace or replace God's truth with error. There is nothing to be ashamed of in this, only matter for legitimate pride in that, by so doing, we are faithful in our following of Christ who came, as He said, to set a man against his own household and saw many of his disciples leave him because he taught what they thought of as hard doctrine. That was a thoroughly "divisive" proceeding on Our Lord's part, but the shame was with those who left, not with Him who stood firm in God's truth. Those who reject the truth always divide. To blame the division on those who proclaim it is as logical as charging the victim of a killing with murder on the ground that it would not have happened had he not been round when the killer was loose. Truth is always divisive; of its very nature the Sword of the Spirit must have a cutting edge. Rob it of that and it is no longer a sword. Tamper with God's word in the interests of acceptance by the world and you may get acceptance, but you will be left without God's word. Which brings us to what is, I think, the real complaint of those in the Church who call us "divisive". What they really object to is that we are standing against their efforts to water down God's truth, to desacralize his Church in order to gain the acceptance of a secularized world. The end of that road is the end of the Church because the Church is either God's truth or it is nothing at all. Perhaps that is why so many who have tampered with God's truth to please the world now find themselves out of God's Church. Their recession is entirely logical; and more will join them before this business is done.

We are Called Extremists

We are also called "right-wing". We need not stay with this for long. Suffice it to say that it is a nonsense, a pathetic example of contemporary slogan-mongering, as logical as concluding that someone who plays on the right wing at rugby football is necessarily a member of the Tory Party.

There is, however, another name given to people like ourselves for whom the truth of the Catholic Church is, of its nature, all or nothing. We are called "extremists" and this term merits a little consideration because of the state of mind it reveals in those who throw it at us. The implication, presumably, is that truth is divisible; that a bridge can be built within the Church today between those who would accommodate God's truth to suit the supposed needs of "modern man" and those who refuse to do so; that somewhere along the line—if only the latter would give a little—a meeting point can be found; that the Church can recover her unity, so tragically lost since the Council, at a point representative of less than the whole of her truth. Once more, it has to be emphasized that this is intrinsically impossible for, of its very nature, such a point is no longer a point of truth: all it represents is a point where truth, by nature indivisible, has surrendered something of itself to error; where it is, in other words, no longer truth. The only meeting point, therefore, between truth and error—if you wish to talk in such terms—is where error makes total surrender to truth. This is what truth, of its very nature, demands, however hard that demand may seem. However extreme it may appear, I have to say, as a follower of the truth, that there can be no other way. Those who see this and profess it are not extremists; they are simply loyal to the truth whose claims they recognise correctly as, of necessity, total and all-embracing.

Sick Church in a Sick World

There is another implication sometimes present in the charge of extremism levelled at those who hold to the whole of the truth, for whom God's truth is all or nothing. It is that loyalty, which is here identified with extremism, is old-fashioned and, therefore, out where contemporary society is concerned. We live in a world that is sick; whose pseudo-intellectual Establishment, in particular, is now without values; for whose members the family is a bore, patriot-

ism a dirty word, God of no consequence and religion a curious pastime reserved for the old-fashioned and out-of-date. Their attitude to life is marked by a cultivated cynicism, which investigation will reveal in most cases as no more than a shield for their cowardice. In their supposedly cultivated, but, in fact, cheap little lives there is no room left for loyalty, nor for those who profess it. They are "loyal" only to themselves, which means that they lead thoroughly unpleasant, selfish lives, covering up their selfishness in the usual way—with a sneer at every manifestation of anything at all that is good. This is the new sick Establishment. It follows that Catholic Progressives silly enough to seek its acceptance must strip themselves of what the new Establishment would consider any *outré* expression of allegiance to their Faith. There must, therefore, be no "extremism" where they are concerned, no simple expression of loyalty to the Faith of their Fathers; no "mediaeval" attachment to ancient, simple devotions like the Rosary or Benediction or Stations of the Cross. The time for all that is past; "modern man" would not approve; loyalty and its kindred virtues are out where he is concerned: it must be out, then, where the owners of progressive Catholic minds are concerned. For what they secretly want, far more than truth, far more, therefore, than loyalty to the truth is the acceptance of "modern man", as identified by them with the new Establishment, which is corroding western society today.

We are Called Traditionalists

Finally, there is the charge that we are "traditionalists". To it we freely and firmly subscribe. In order to see why we do so, a distinction is essential and must itself be followed by further explanation. The distinction is between "traditionalist" and "archaic". The latter is what we are not, for it refers to a state of mind in love with a particular period or style of the past to the point where it is frozen for all time as something to be kept forever in unalterable, original

and unchangeable form. This is not the mind of the traditionalist. He does not regard the form, say, of the Church's ancient liturgy as unchangeable. He knows that, through the ages, it has been submitted to loving, almost imperceptible development, which has served only to enrich it. He is not against change which he sees precisely as enrichment to the extent that it is true change, which he would define as a well-tempered flowering out of tradition; a quiet, careful growth from roots well set in the past. From this, he is quick to distinguish rootless change of the sort that has been thrust on the Church under the umbrella of a bogus democracy in the post-conciliar years; an overnight change of form in the Mass, for instance, and in the mode and manner of the Church's devotional life, which has been so drastic in content and inflicted at such brutal speed that many of the Faithful have been on the receiving end of a shock sufficiently traumatic to rob the Church in their eyes, not only of its ancient and well-loved forms, but of its substance as well. Where they are concerned—and I refer here to Catholicism's silent majority—the ethos of their Faith is no longer what it was; in some cases to the point where it has gone completely out of their lives. I wonder if those responsible for inflicting these changes on the Faithful at such ruthless speed and, in so many cases, against their will, have had or will ever have any realization of the fact that, through their actions, they have succeeded in driving thousands and thousands of loyal and devoted Catholics out of the Church. And let them not blame those who have gone in tears. Let them not scold or rant at them. Let them remember that no one is bound by an impossibility and that one reason why so many have gone from the Church in past years is that they have been confronted with a situation which was and is psychologically impossible for them to bear. As I see it, responsibility for their going rests primarily, not with themselves, but with those who have thrust on the silent majority of Catholics everywhere and in defiance of the most elementary tenets of basic psychology a whole series of hasty and ill-judged, so-called reforms. I

find it astounding not only that this should have been done, but that those responsible should remain apparently unaware of the havoc that has been caused, continuing to look *outside* the Church for the cause of the rot that has come to herself by her own hand from *within*.

Psychology and Rootless Change

It is this, I think that traditionalists particularly resent. They regard the rootless changes of the past ten years as senseless psychologically, so senseless, in fact as to be totally incomprehensible and, as some would say, sinister in this sense that—had a plan been drawn up for the destruction of Catholic life and worship—it could not have been accomplished better than through the rootless changes rushed through—as it would seem, for their own sake and without a particle of regard for the feelings of the Faithful—during the past ten years. As I have said already, it is and remains inexplicable on a basis of the most elementary psychological principle that such a thing should ever have been done. Even more inexplicable, perhaps, is the fact that, having been done, the situation so created—the welter of doctrinal, liturgical and moral confusion in which the Church now lives—should be allowed to endure. Quite frankly, I find this astounding, not only because of the heartlessness it represents on the part of the ecclesiastical authority; but because of the effects of the confusion which will grow steadily worse over the years unless firm action is taken. Think for a moment of the confused — and sometimes heretical — doctrine being taught in seminaries, training colleges, catechetical centres and schools. Think, next, of the confusions created in the minds of the Faithful, adults and children, by the confused teaching inflicted on them in churches, lecture-halls and classrooms. The end can only be what we would expect—first, that the Faithful will be left without Faith and, second, that the Church will be left without Faithful — not because of their going from the Church, but because of the Church going from them in this

sense, that its teaching, as carried to them, is no longer true teaching because those who teach in church and school no longer know that teaching.

It is in this way that the Church is corroded, as a result of the upheavals thrust on it through rootless change of the sort that strikes first at its liturgy and popular devotions, then at its doctrine. *Lex orandi est lex credendi*, a man prays and worships as he believes: when prayer and worship are wrenched out of context, belief follows suit. It is in this way that our Faith is being stolen from us today, before our very eyes.

(To be continued)

PRO FIDE BOOK SERVICE

THE ENEMY WITHIN THE GATE by Fr. John McKee	£3.55
THE DEVASTATED VINEYARD by Dietrich von Hildebrand	£3.30
THE RECOVERY OF THE SACRED by Prof. J. Hitchcock	£3.30
THE CULT OF REVOLUTION IN THE CHURCH by John Eppstein	£3.50
THE HUNGRY SHEEP by John Sheridan	£3.75
THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD by Fr. Rodger Charles, S.J.	70p
THE DECLINE AND FALL OF RADICAL CATHOLICISM by Prof. Hitchcock	75p
THE TEACHINGS OF POPE PAUL VI	£3.35

(All prices include postage)

Write for full Catalogue to: PRO FIDE BOOK SERVICE,
39 Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon.

Where any group of workers pay is out of line with the general level of rewards for work at a comparable level there is discontent. Sooner or later adjustments will have to be made. The Houghton Committee has made recommendations for bringing teachers more into line with general levels. But when such an exercise is undertaken at a time of economic stringency there are bound to be difficult questions to answer. Big increases for those at the top may be questioned; and others too may look for similar adjustments.

Reflections on Houghton

J. M. JACKSON

THE country has been living under the shadow of an incomes policy now for something like ten years—longer if one counts back to the ‘pay pause’ introduced by Mr. Selwyn Lloyd in 1961. There was, however, a relaxation of the policy in subsequent years, until in the 1964 election the Labour Party made great play on the possibility of an incomes policy proving the means of avoiding the stop-go policies that had plagued the country since the end of World War II. The Conservative Government had introduced the ‘pay pause’ in 1961 as an emergency measure, but in the 1964 election the Labour Party was offering the idea of a wages policy as a long-term measure which would promote more steady economic growth. Since the implementation of an incomes policy by the Labour Government after its election in 1964 (as an emergency measure in support of other policies rather than instead of them) an incomes policy has never been far away. Returned to power in the early 1970s the Conservatives tried to manage without an incomes policy but, in an inflationary situation caused largely by the Labour Government’s abandonment of its

incomes policy immediately before the election, it had to change its mind. In 1974, the Labour Party was pledged to abandon the idea of a statutory incomes policy but maintained that the 'social contract' would ensure that there was voluntary restraint in wage bargaining. It remains to be seen whether it will in fact be possible for the Government to continue to claim that the social contract is the answer to wage inflation when even with the fastest rate of inflation the country has known earnings continue to increase even faster.

The Public Sector

There has always been the danger that when an incomes policy is in operation the public sector suffers more than the private. The Government is naturally anxious to enforce its policy, and is therefore unlikely to see large groups of its own employees secure salary increases that breach that policy. In the private sector, however, important groups may secure pay increases that go beyond what is permitted by the incomes policy. Sometimes this may be a simple disregarding of the policy. It may be that there are no adequate sanctions to ensure that the policy is enforced. Or it may be that there is scope for earnings to increase in ways which do not openly breach the incomes policy. Many workers are on payment by results. They may be paid under schemes which give them a bonus for the time saved compared with the time allowed for a job. If there is some small change in the nature of the job, it may be re-timed. If the new time allowed is unduly generous it follows that workers will in general achieve bigger savings on the time allowed and so qualify for bigger bonuses. There has been no change in rates of pay or the bonus scheme; merely a change in the time allowed for particular jobs in response to minor changes in the jobs themselves, but an unrealistic time allowance can be slipped in which has the effect of evading the restrictions of incomes policy. In other cases, lax management may allow unnecessary overtime, thereby enabling

workers to increase their earnings for a volume of work that could have been done within normal hours.

Some groups may be less able to secure increases in earnings in these roundabout ways. Teachers are paid a fixed salary and there are no opportunities for overtime or bonus earnings. Many other groups of salaried workers are in a similar position. During 1974 it was clear that there was considerable discontent in the profession over salaries, especially in Scotland where serious disruption in the schools occurred. 'Industrial action' was taken by the Scottish teachers to try and obtain an interim award by the end of the year, even though there was the promise that any award resulting from the Houghton inquiry would be backdated to May 1974. The teaching unions in Scotland displayed the same irresponsible attitude that has come to be associated with so many other unions these days. They were prepared to sacrifice the welfare of the children for whom they are responsible for the sake of securing their money perhaps a month earlier (in which object they failed) or in order to extract a large interim payment which would force the hand of the independent inquiry by setting a floor to any award that could be made. What is more they displayed the same hypocrisy as many industrial unions have done in denying their responsibility for their own actions. As usual, they were not responsible for any harm done to the children's education: that was the fault of the Government for not immediately capitulating to the teachers' demands rather than waiting for the results of the independent inquiry.

The Houghton Proposals

The Houghton Committee has made proposals which involve some differences between England and Wales on the one hand and Scotland on the other. Although the Scottish teachers are dissatisfied with the fact that the increases proposed at the lower end of the scale are much less than the £10 a week minimum increase demanded and with the failure to give specific rewards for qualifications held the

proposals generally involve a rather more favourable treatment of Scottish teachers than English. In the following discussion, the main emphasis will be on the English proposals.

The basic salary for teachers in April 1974 was £1,449, rising to £2,553 after 15 years. At the time of the Houghton Committee's Report, threshold payments which had been allowed under the Conservative Government's incomes policy raised this scale to £1,679 to £2,783. Good honours graduates started two increments up the salary scale and had two further increments at the top, taking them to a maximum salary, including threshold payments, of £2,963. The new basic scale proposed by Houghton is £1,970 (including threshold) rising to £3,299 after 13 years. Again good honours graduates start two increments up the scale and have an extended range to £3,569. The recommendation therefore involves an increase of £228 for a teacher at the start of his career, or 13.6 per cent of the starting salary at the time of the report. At the top of the scale, the increase proposed was £516 or 18.5 per cent. The Houghton Committee has therefore proposed increases at the top of the scale which are not only bigger in absolute terms but in percentage terms too. Possibly some of the teachers would have preferred the opposite approach, perhaps a flat rate increase that would have given smaller percentage increases at the top.

The Houghton Report gives little in the way of comparison with other occupations. The only comparisons made are with the median starting salaries of graduates in all fields. On these comparisons, teachers appear to have been doing relatively well, even in May 1974, to which date the recommendations of the Committee were to be backdated. A survey by the University of Leeds Careers Office showed that male graduates in Arts had median starting salaries of £1,639, Social Science and Law £1,540 and Science £1,595.* Graduates in teaching started at £1,605. With

* These are median figures. This means that half of all graduates would have received higher starting salaries than these and half lower starting salaries.

the increases proposed by the Houghton Committee, the initial advantage of the graduate teacher would be increased. On the other hand, in many employments earnings may increase rapidly in the early years of a person's career. In teaching, on the other hand, progress is slow. Under the old scale, increments averaged just over £82 a year, and under the Houghton proposals they are still only £107 a year on average over the whole scale. At the present time, average earnings for male manual workers are around £50 a week. A teacher will reach this level only after seven years on the Houghton proposals and even at the top if the basic scale will be only 27 per cent above this average. The maximum for a teacher on the basic scale will be £3,299; ten per cent of manual workers will be earning over £4,000.

Of course, to estimate the attractiveness of teaching as a career we have to take account of the promotion opportunities. There are posts of responsibility which in England and Wales take teachers onto higher salary scales. *About 35 per cent of teachers are on salary scales higher than the basic one. This means that a much higher proportion of those entering the profession can expect at some stage of their career to receive some promotion. There are in all four scales for promoted teachers (below the level of deputy head) and the highest of these carries a maximum salary of £5,207 on the Houghton recommendations. This salary, however, will only be payable to a head of department in a very large school. It is possible, however, to get some idea of the salaries that will be payable to promoted teachers in typical schools. We may take a Primary school with 300 to 500 pupils, a comprehensive school with nearly 1,100 pupils (about 165 in the Sixth Form), and a very large comprehensive about twice this size.* The table below shows the salary scales that apply to the highest paid assistant teachers

* In Scotland, teachers remain on a single salary scale and posts of responsibility carry a flat rate addition to this salary scale. The additions are related to the number of pupils in the school and in the higher age groups. In England, a formula related to pupil numbers, with a weighting for age, determines the appropriate salary scale for promoted teachers, including heads and deputy heads.

* This assumes a six or twelve stream entry for the comprehensives.

and to the head and deputy head. (There will, of course, be assistant teachers who are paid on intermediate scales.)

	Highest paid Assistant Teacher	Deputy Head Teacher	Head Teacher
Primary school 350 pupils	£2,333 to £3,704	£2,957 to £3,983	£4,214 to £4,754
Comprehensive school 1,100 pupils	£3,839 to £4,207	£5,249 to £5,789	£6,965 to £7,805
Comprehensive school 2,200 pupils	£3,839 to £4,207	£5,924 to £6,242	£8,240 to £8,753

It is apparent that there are now substantial rewards in teaching for those who reach the higher levels of the profession. Starting salaries are not unreasonable either. The good honours graduate who enters teaching will, in fact, start at a salary that is virtually equal to that of a university lecturer (£2,333 compared with £2,348) but is only likely to progress slowly unless promoted. There is perhaps a case for retaining the present ranges in the salary scales but perhaps shortening the scales; that is giving larger increments so that the maximum is reached more quickly. Nevertheless, even the increases proposed by Houghton will improve the position of most teachers quite significantly. Under the old scale, a newly appointed, non-graduate teacher would, if single have take-home pay of about £23 a week. Under Houghton his take home pay will rise by nearly £3. A non-graduate teacher who is married with one child and two years service will find his pay increases by over £3 a week from £28, and a teacher with four years service, married with two children will find his net income rises from £32 to £36 a week. *This last figure compares not

* This is his take home salary plus Family Allowance.

unfavourably with the net income of £38.50 of the average manual worker with a non-working wife and two children.

Some Implications of the Report

One of the problems of adjusting salaries in one profession at a time when general restraint in the wage and salary field is being called for is that other groups may also look for comparable increases. In addition, substantial increases at the top may seem unreasonable when the workers at the lower end of the scale in many fields are expected to be content with relatively modest increases. The salaries of the heads of the largest schools will rise, at the maximum, from £6,686 to £8,953, an increase of £2,267—as much as the total salary of some young teachers. Even more likely to cause discontent are the proposals, made shortly before the publication of the Houghton Report, for increases of as much as 50 per cent for some top civil servants and judges, proposals involving increases of as much as £8,000. Are increases of this magnitude justified at this time? The point that needs to be stressed, however, is that we have people at the top of certain professions being paid substantially less than the top people in other fields. Is it wrong to give the men and women in charge of our biggest schools a salary comparable to that earned by those in comparable positions in other fields? Or are we to expect them to hold back until times are more suitable for big pay increases, by which time other salaries too will be increasing and the gap to be closed will have become even greater.

Should other groups look for comparable increases? The answer to this is that it depends upon what one means by comparable increases. If it is merely a matter of some group arguing that because teachers have been given increases amounting to something like 27 per cent they should get a similar percentage increase, then the answer must be an emphatic NO. If, however, it is a matter of groups who can rightly expect some reasonable relationship with teachers' salaries being paid substantially less than they too are en-

titled to appropriate increases. If the country cannot afford to give them these increases then neither can it afford the increases that have been proposed for the teachers.

It has already been observed that the starting salary for a good honours graduate teacher in England is more or less the same as for a university lecturer. The average good honours graduate teacher will be of much lower calibre than the university lecturer. There seems no reason why, in fact, the university starting salary should not be raised to at least the £2,595 starting salary of the Scottish graduate secondary teacher.* At the other end of the scale, principal lecturers in institutes of higher education (including colleges of education) will have a maximum of £6,759 and heads of departments £7,829 compared with corresponding maxima of £6,206 and £7,757 for the universities. Moreover, teachers in institutes of higher education who are engaged mainly in higher levels of work (not only work of degree level) are recommended automatic progression to a grade that carries a maximum of £5,642 whereas a university lecturer will only progress beyond £5,126 if he can satisfy fairly stringent criteria for promotion and there is a vacancy in the higher grade.

* Why the Scottish graduate teacher should be paid more than the English is a question not answered by the Houghton Committee except in so far as they point out that this was the existing pattern.

Why are nurses and teachers so badly paid?
In what sense are all men equal? Why is so
much authority in doctrine attributed to
the Fathers of the Church?

Any Questions ?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Why are nurses and teachers so badly paid?

You know what our economy is like, and how the country as a whole, starting with the politicians, is deeply concerned for our standard of living, the gross national product, the balance of payments and export drives. The activity which is of first importance to give the country comfort in its concern is production of goods which can be sold. Next in importance come the services which directly help production. Those two activities are most generously rewarded because they help most to solvency and prosperity. They make and bake the national cake. They must have a big slice of it. What is left goes to the non-producers of material goods. How do nurses increase the gross national product, apart from cutting down the number of working hours lost by illness? And teachers? They help to train the next generation of workers, but that is only a remote contribution to national wealth. If nurses and teachers went on strike, the lights would not go out, British Rail would still run its trains, industry would not suffer. They may be necessary to the well-being of the country but not to production; and it is production which matters, to governments above all. Nurses and teachers (and I think civil servants) have no lever with which to prise more money out of the authorities.

There is something wrong with a society which treats so shabbily two professions which are its devoted and generous servants. The members of both bring to their work a sense of vocation and not just an interest in a particular

livelihood. Their training is hard and their skill is notable; and they do their work as persons dealing with persons. We should not require them to live on their sense of vocation.

In what sense are all men equal?

In the sense that each one has a right to be different from all the others. I put it that way to emphasize the wrongness of what is called egalitarianism, which tries to make out that all men are, or ought to be, alike. That is a version of human equality which fails to respect some of its own favourite principles or battle cries, such as development of personality, parity of esteem, and equal opportunity. Its basic fault is to neglect the uniqueness of the person by insisting overmuch on the sameness of the nature. Egalitarianism is so insidious that it emerges inside the Church in the desire to level down all kinds of priesthood to the one priesthood to which all the faithful are admitted by baptism. Another form of it is the fierce resentment that some feel because religious life is called "a state of perfection"—no state must be more perfect than other states.

In what are all men equal? In being creatures of God on the way back to Him Who made them, in being entitled to respect, and in possessing a dozen or so rights such as the right to life and all the means of life. That level of equality has not yet been reached in the world, and there are inequalities which are unjust and should be removed. So far, we are all egalitarians. But what is equality of opportunity? Opportunity for what? Surely, to be the best self that one is capable of being. But no two best selves are alike; and opportunities to become them must be different. Because one boy in a dozen is capable of learning to be a good surgeon, you don't put all twelve in for surgery. They and all others as far as possible should be enabled to discover their talents and to use them; but the talents vary and use of them will bring their possessors to different levels of education, usefulness, employment, success, and reward.

Why is so much authority in doctrine attributed to the Fathers of the Church?

The Fathers of the Church are those Catholic writers of antiquity whose doctrine was orthodox and received as such by the teaching Church and whose lives were markedly holy. Some were bishops, one at least was a layman, and one, St. Ephrem the Syrian, was a deacon. Their importance comes from the witness they bore in the early Church to the accepted explanations of the Creed and interpretations of Scripture; and so they are a notable part of the Church's tradition. They have an authority second only to that of the great Councils such as those of Nicaea, Ephesus and Chalcedon. It is authority of a different kind, being personal and not official, but it is very strong.

The age of the Fathers ends in the West with Isidore of Seville, about 636 A.D. and in the East with St. John Damascene, about 750 A.D. The lists of Father are popular, in the sense that the title is not formally bestowed, as is the title "Doctor of the Church"; but there is general agreement about the names which should go on the lists. Most Catholics will recognize names like Basil the Great, Cyprian, Athanasius, Ambrose, Hilary and Augustine. If opportunity offers, Catholics would greatly profit by reading some of the theology and spiritual teaching of the Fathers of the Church. The new breviary has many well-chosen passages in what used to be called Matins; and some libraries may have a copy of *The Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers* in four volumes, edited by M. F. Toal. A recent book by Aelred Squire, *Asking the Fathers* (S.P.C.K. 1973) is about prayer, and the "Fathers" of the title means spiritual masters of all ages; but it contains many short but telling quotations from the Fathers of the Church.

"Infiltration" is part of communist tactics. How likely is communist infiltration of the Church?

Communism is intended to be an ideology for the whole

of mankind. Of its nature it is universal, like the Catholic Church. The allegiance of a committed communist is to that cause which knows no frontiers, and it does not admit the limited loyalty of patriotism. Communists have therefore a distinct advantage over nation states in the recruitment of spies. During the Russian-German war of 1941-5 the Russians had a nest of their spies, the *Rote Kapelle*, in the German Air Ministry, and others in the Economics Ministry and the Foreign Office. In Japan they had a most competent spy on the staff of the German ambassador.

Infiltration is not the same as spying, but it works in much the same way, by getting communists into key positions in organizations that they can influence to the advantage of communism. It is well known that there are communists in innocent-seeming academic bodies and cultural societies. Their great enemy, which competes with them for universal allegiance, is the Catholic Church. If they did not at least try to manipulate the Church from within they would be acting entirely out of character. They hold positions of importance in the Orthodox Churches. They may have well-placed fellow-travellers in the Catholic Church in satellite countries. They are quite capable of instructing Party members to embark on an ecclesiastical career, following the usual course of studies, recommending themselves to the authorities by prayer and good works, and going up the ecclesiastical ladder step by step. There are stories going about of priests who, by accident, have been found to be carrying their Party card. I have no idea if they are true; but I should be surprised if they were not founded on fact.

Book Review

Last Straw?

Ministry and Ordination (Statement on the Doctrine of the Ministry agreed by the Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission); published by the Catholic Information Office and obtainable from the Catholic Truth Society at 25p; pp. 38.

The news that the expected Ministerial Agreement produced by the "International Anglican/Roman Catholic Commission" was to be published on December 13, 1973 aroused at the time a certain amount of speculation as to how the thorny question of Anglican orders would be tackled. Well, now we know. A distinction was made between *what* each believes an "ordained minister" is and *where* each recognises the "ordained ministry" as existing, and the International Commission limited itself in this latest statement to the former question. In this way the embarrassing question as to how Anglican orders will be recognised in spite of Leo XIII's judgment regarding their invalidity was seemingly put off until another day.

I say "seemingly" deliberately because, if the Agreed Ministerial Statement is not now repudiated as heretical (along with the preparatory Windsor Agreement on the Eucharist) by a very large number of priests—or of course by those whose prime responsibility it is to preserve the integrity of the Faith—then, logically and psychologically, this monumental objective of false ecumenism will have been achieved.

Leo XIII, in *Apostolicae Curae* (1896), judged Anglican Orders to be invalid on the grounds of defect of form in the Edwardine ordinal and of defect of intention in its use—the former defect at least being perpetuated in the revised (Restoration) ordinal. The Anglican ordinal, by its deliberate omission of all reference to the order of priesthood and

its grace and power, produced a quasi-sacramental form which failed to signify (as a valid form must) that which is caused in the authentic Sacrament of Orders.

This historic reason for the un-Catholic ordinal (and thus for the lack of valid orders) was the Reformers' disbelief in the traditional priesthood, a disbelief grounded in their not believing in the Sacrifice that priesthood had been ordained to offer. They did not, of course, refuse all use of the term "priest", any more than they refused all belief in the Eucharist; "priest" in a very general sense being someone appointed to conduct the public worship of God, and also being the traditional English rendering of that second order in the ministry which is mentioned in the New Testament. Furthermore, the alternative, "presbyter", was very soon the mark of those who rejected an episcopal form of church government, and so even more dangerous than the title "priest" — once that had been dissociated from its traditional meaning of one who offers sacrifice.

Once, however, we come to recognise that (in Bishop Clarke's words) "doctrines which they once regarded as essential" are no longer barriers to "unity of faith", we will have to conclude that the differences of favoured wording did after all clothe the same faith. So, the misunderstanding overcome, no barrier will remain to recognising Anglican orders! Such a conclusion is entailed by an acceptance of the Eucharistic and Ministerial Agreements. Those who find nothing to worry about now will have no cause to complain when they are presented with the ultimate "faith accompli".

In sometimes somewhat strange, but carefully measured sentences, the Windsor Eucharistic Agreement eliminated from the "Christian faith of the Eucharist" the doctrines that each valid Eucharist is a renewal of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and hence a true, propitiatory sacrifice; and that the inner reality of the bread and wine is converted (transubstantiated) into the reality of the Body and Blood of the living Christ. In their place were substituted the heresies of the memorial only of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and a "becoming" Christ's Body and Blood entirely compatible with

an effective symbolism and a "real presence" in the act of communicating only.

Having perpetrated this first outrage — the verbally somewhat sophisticated reduction of the Mass to a Protestant "Lord's Supper", and of the abiding, substantial and adorable Real Presence to the spiritual presence of a Protestant Communion—the next stage, Ministerial Agreement, was child's play. By laying great stress on entirely secondary matters, and by raising various historical and theological distractions, the fundamental betrayal could be passed off quite openly (in para. 13 of the Statement, and also on page 2 of Bishop Clarke's own Introduction). The Eucharist is made to be only "the *memorial* of the death and resurrection of Christ, whose atoning sacrifice reconciled the world to God" (Bishop Clarke), or, more briefly, "the eucharist is the memorial of the sacrifice of Christ".

This is not the Catholic doctrine that the offering of the Sacrifice of the Mass makes a memorial of Christ's death and resurrection, but the heresy condemned by the Council of Trent that the Mass is not itself a sacrifice, but only the memorial of the Sacrifice offered on the Cross. It is also the exact teaching of the Anglican Catechism in the Book of Common Prayer.

Once the Eucharist itself is held not to be a sacrifice, the minister who presides at it may not strictly be termed a priest. His presiding at the memorial of Christ's sacrifice puts him in a "relation to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice". A symbolic, "sacramental", relationship to the past event, not a sacramental participation (through the sacramental character) in the priesthood of Christ himself, exercised in the daily renewal of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

That really is it. That is how the illusion of retaining Catholic doctrine while agreeing with Anglicans of all shades of opinion is performed. A piece of verbal "sleight of hand" whose "success" depends largely on its breathtaking audacity.

If the bulk of Catholic priests cannot be roused now from their present trance-like condition—and failing the

re-activation of the Magisterium—it will be psychologically impossible to prevent the next stage of the “dialogue”: recognition of Anglican orders (“it was all a regrettable mistake”) and of the “apostolicity” of the Anglican communion—culminating in “union without absorbtion” (as the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury terms it). And not only psychologically. As we said above, if the teachings of the Agreed Statements are not repudiated as heretical betrayals of the Catholic Faith, there will remain no logical reasons for objecting to the “faith accompli” of reunion-apostasy.

“*Lex orandi est lex credendi*”, “the law of prayer is the law of belief”. Just as Pope Paul has been ill-served by the “Catholic” members of the International Commission, so was he ill-served by the Roman Liturgy Consilium, which—under the pretence of implementing the minor changes recommended by the Vatican II Liturgy Constitution—produced a whole New Rite of the Mass favouring heresy.

The *Institutio Generalis* of 1969 (the original, official introduction to and explanation of the New Mass) defines the Mass in such a way as to omit “the whole, authentic substance of the mystery of the Eucharist” (cf. Vatican II Decree on Ecumenism), making of it instead only the enactment of “the memorial at the Last Supper of the Lord’s death and resurrection” (as Vatican II describes the Protestant Eucharist).

“The Lord’s Supper or Mass is the assembly or gathering of the people of God come together under the presidency of the priest to celebrate the memorial of the Lord”—Article 7 of the original edition of the *Institutio Generalis*.

In response to widespread protests (most notably those by Cardinal Ottaviani and the late Cardinal Bacci) at this non-Catholic definition of the Mass, it was revised in a second edition early in 1970. This time important Catholic clauses were inserted into the original text, but it is striking that they are offered simply as alternatives to the original clauses and not as true qualifications of them. In this way, even in the guise of reaffirming orthodoxy, “respectability”

was given to phrases which in normal Catholic and Protestant usage bear no such equivalent meanings.

The New Mass itself, however, remains unrevised. In the traditional Roman Mass the priest offers the host and the chalice as already symbolically what they will become in actuality at the consecration. In the New Mass, bread and wine are offered as such. The sacrificial intention has disappeared, along with the sacrificial gifts signified. Accordingly, with the "Suscipe, sancte Pater" and "Offerimus tibi" omitted, the remaining "In spiritu humilitatis" is no more than an expression of personal worship. The "epiclesis of the offertory", the "Veni sanctificator", is also eliminated, as is the "Suscipe, sancta Trinitas". With no indication of the oblations, even the "Orate, fratres" is rendered totally ambiguous as between the heretical "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving", and the Catholic renewal (through the twofold consecration) of the Sacrifice of the Cross. The New Reformers' suppression, in the *Novus Ordo Missae*, of unambiguous references to the Sacrifice of the Mass is total, culminating in the removal of the recollection of the Sacrifice so recently offered—the "Placeat tibi"—before the priest bestows God's blessing on the faithful.

An examination of the vernacular texts of the New Mass shows that the Roman Consilium has been only too efficiently helped in its work of doctrinal suppression and change by such other "International commissions" as the International Committee for English in the Liturgy (ICEL). Any remaining ambiguity—allowing of a Catholic interpretation—has been diligently removed. We have already remarked on how the change of context has removed from the "In spiritu humilitatis" its traditional meaning. Not content with this change of meaning in the traditional words, ICEL had to complete the transformation.

"In a humble spirit and a contrite heart may we be received by Thee, O Lord; and let our sacrifice be so made in Thy sight this day that it may please Thee, O Lord God", is "renewed" by ICEL into: "Lord God, we ask you to receive us and be pleased with the sacrifice we offer you

with humble and contrite hearts”.

Ignoring the anathema of Trent, the Roman Consilium has offered an “optional abrogation” of the Roman Canon for those who find its “pre-Reformation language of eucharistic sacrifice” erroneous. What ICEL has been able to “translate into” even the Roman Canon is beyond the wit of honest men. It remains only to point out that none of the three new Eucharistic Prayers contain any mention of sacrifice prior to the consecration, which (according to the teaching of the Popes) effects the immolation. After the consecration there remain — in the words of Dr. J. W. Charley, an Evangelical Anglican member of the International Commission—“echoes of the pre-Reformation language of eucharistic sacrifice”. Not so, however, in ICEL’s version of Canon II.

“In memory of his death and resurrection, we offer you, Father, this life-giving bread, this saving cup”. The “echo” has died away to vanishing point! The “bread” and the “cup” are offered as a memorial “toast” to the death and resurrection of Christ. In the context of the New Mass, Canon II is entirely non-sacrificial.

It is Pope Leo XIII who, in *Apostolicae Curae*, supplies us with the definitive comment on the work of the Roman Consilium and its collaborators:—

“The history of the period tells clearly enough what were the sentiments of the authors of the (Rite) towards the Catholic Church, who were the heterodox associates whose help they invoked, what was the aim they were pursuing. They knew only too well the intimate bond which unites faith with worship, ‘the law of belief with the law of prayer’, and so, under the pretext of restoring it to its primitive form, they corrupted the order of the liturgy in many respects to adapt it to the errors of the Innovators. As a result, not only is there in the whole (New Mass with Canon II) no clear mention of sacrifice . . . as we have already indicated, every trace of these and similar things remaining in such prayers of the Catholic rite as were not completely rejected, was purposely removed and obliterated.” Amen.

By barely tolerating the traditional Roman Mass (the Tridentine Mass, codified by Pope St. Pius V in 1570—see *Quo Primum* in every traditional Roman altar missal); by raising no objections to the *Novus Ordo Missae*; by accepting and authorising its even more unfaithful translations; in spite of all the efforts of a minority of priests and laity to alert them to the reality of what was happening, the Bishops of England and Wales have prepared the way for the formal betrayal of the Mass perpetrated by two of their number in the Windsor Eucharistic Agreement and the Canterbury Ministerial Statement.

By abandoning the traditional Roman Mass (the Tridentine Latin Mass); by using the New Mass—Canon II included—usually in blatantly traitorous translation; by taking no stand for orthodoxy in Catholic schools, colleges of education and catechetical centres; and finally by accepting the Windsor Agreement in silence; the majority of our priests have surrendered the foundation and reason for their very priesthood—reduced to a ministry of the word and sacraments in the heretical Ministerial Agreement.

As for the majority of the laity—with such pastors, who can blame the “silent majority” for conforming to the New Reformation!

The Anglican affair has reached the very edge of apostasy. “The fort is betrayed of them that should have defended it”. After four hundred years of English and Welsh Catholic knowledge of the Anglican heresy; with all the experience of converts; from such Counter-Reformation champions of the Faith as St. Edmund Campion, through Cardinal Newman and the Nineteenth Century Second Spring; right to the present day—to come to this!

It was a prophetic gesture when Pope Paul canonised forty of our English and Welsh Martyrs without the traditional *Te Deum* — which had celebrated their heavenly birthdays at those colleges “beyond the seas”—and with Anglican hymns! O you Holy Martyrs of England and Wales preserve us from the threatening apostasy of the Second Reformation.

W. J. Morgan.